DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 347 HE 013 855

AUTHOR Woodard, Prince B.

TITLE Total State Planning for Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO IEP-909-3
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education (Philadelphia, PA, May 1975).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Planning; College Role; *Cooperative Planning; Decision Making; Educational Assessment; Governance; Government Role; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Private Colleges; Program Evaluation; Proprietary Schools; State Colleges; *State Government; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

Principles for state planning for postsecondary education are considered, and three hypothetical case studies are presented for discussion purposes. The first and basic principle is the need for a clear and categorical mandate for state planning. A second principle is to develop full knowledge of the authority and responsibilities for postsecondary education of the several segments of state government. The primary postsecondary planning body and its staff should seek effective means to keep both the executive and legislative branches fully informed of the priority needs, problems, strengths, and future plans for postsecondary education. Close communication must be maintained with other state and regional agencies. A third principle is that the current and projected status of all existing units in the postsecondary education enterprise be fully understood. The planning agency should give study to the goals and conditions in the public, private, and proprietary postsecondary institutions. Fourthly, it is essential that proper differentiation and attention be directed within the on-going planning process to the components of total planning: strategic planning and tactical planning. Strategic planning establishes the broad frame of reference, the fundamental premises and the philosophies and purposes to be observed in tactical planning, which focuses on a limited set of issues that have high priority. Additionally, sufficient current, relevant, and reliable data must be developed and maintained, and timely and continuous dissemination of information must be insured. There must exist both the capacity and willingness to make and implement decisions, and both the planning process and plans should be given periodic review and evaluation. It is also important to recognize that different participants in the planning process can have an impact on planning. (SW)

ED202347

Inservice Education Program (IEP)

Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

TOTAL STATE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PRINCE B. WOODARD

President
Mary Washington College
and Former Chancellor
West Virginia Board of Higher Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE013255

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 1975

IEP Reprint No. 909-3

Education Commission of the States

Inservice Education Program (IEP)
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

SHEEO

The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers

SESSION I

TOTAL STATE PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Prince B. Woodard

Total state planning for postsecondary education is in its infancy. In the years ahead research, trial and error efforts and the accumulation of a mass of experience will teach us much about the state planning process. We have a great deal to learn.

I have been a student of higher education administration and a participant in the higher education planning process for more than twenty years. Over this span of time I have occupied a variety of planning roles including those of chief executive officer of a state coordinating council, chancellor of a state governing board responsible for fifteen colleges and universities, and president of a state, four year liberal arts college. Perhaps it is because my perspective has changed so many times that I sense much remains to be learned regarding both the processes and procedures of effective total state planning for postsecondary education. My remarks will focus on "planning principles" which I have formulated on the basis of my experiences in state planning for postsecondary education.

Fundamental to my presentation is acceptance of the fact that a recital of the need for state-wide planning is not required. Hundreds of pages have been written, especially in the last several years, attesting to this need.

Further, the assumption underlying my comments is that all in this audience concur in the belief that comprehensive state planning should be a positive force, a leadership function, concerned with policies, procedures and practices which provide for all citizens adequate and appropriate postsecondary educational opportunities of high quality.

Before delineating what I consider to be "essential principles" of total state-wide planning for postsecondary education, let me identify the several planning groups which I feel should utilize the principles I shall discuss.

Today we have state coordinating or state governing boards in nearly all states. These coordinate, or coordinate-govern a variety of postsecondary elements. Some have responsibility for four year institutions, others are concerned with all public institutions, while still others embrace all public institutions and in a limited way include private institutions as well. In addition, we now have in all but four states (Colorado, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Wisconsin) State 1202 Commissions responsible for total state-wide postsecondary

HE 013 255

Dr. Woodard is the President, Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia, and former Chancellor, West Virginia Board of Higher Education.

planning thereby allowing the state to qualify for federal funding under Title X of Education Amendment of 1972. These commissions are expected to plan for total postsecondary education. They are new, having been in operation one year or less, and what they will actually achieve is yet to be seen. As planning bodies, all of these various boards and commissions may find the following planning principles of value.

It should be understood that basic planning principles cannot be totally isolated one from another. They interrelate. For discussion purposes only, each is presented as a totally separate principle.

Stated in its simplest form, the first principle to be observed is the need for an official mandate for state planning. While of a different nature than the other principles to be cited, this first principle is basic and fundamental.

Total state planning for postsecondary education does not become a reality by merely recognizing a need for it. There must be a legal base for planning. Legal authority may be contained in state statutes, executive orders, or other official and valid instruments of government. In addition to the need for a clear legal basis, a substantial and sustaining state commitment in support of planning is also required. By this, I mean financial support for a professional staff of high competence. Quality state planning is dependent upon a quality staff and the procurement and retention of a competent professional staff is dependent upon an attractive salary structure.

Closely allied to the point that quality planning requires quality staff is the related principle that no state planning body should attempt to develop a staff possessing all needed planning competencies. This is impractical, if not impossible. Specialists will be needed and should be brought in to perform specific tasks and offer periodic guidance and counsel to the planning body. Adequate funds must be available for this purpose.

Finally, a genuine mandate for successful state planning requires a policy board or commission whose members are dedicated to service and committed to the promotion of postsecondary educational opportunities to serve the needs of all citizens. These board members must be insightful, must view their role as one of public service, must be politically astute, but should <u>not</u> be political-office oriented.

I place <u>the need for a clear and categorical mandate for state planning as the first and foremost principle</u> for without it, even though the need for planning may be clearly identified, only limited success will be obtained.

<u>A second principle</u> basic to successful total state planning for <u>postsecondary education is to develop full knowledge of the authority and responsibilities for postsecondary education of the several segments</u>

of state government. In any state both the executive and legislative branches of government have a major impact on what happens to post-secondary education. The primary postsecondary planning body and its staff should seek effective ways to keep both branches fully informed of the priority needs, strengths, weaknesses, and future plans for postsecondary education. Similarly close communication, cooperation and sharing of information must be maintained with other agencies of government such as state and regional comprehensive planning bodies, the state board for elementary and secondary education, state budget office, state office of personnel, environmental control office and others. Each of these may have legal responsibilities for certain aspects of postsecondary education. It is wise and productive to be of every possible assistance and to maintain close communication with all state agencies and offices that relate in any way to postsecondary education.

The third principle I wish to offer is that it is important that the current and projected status of all existing units in the post-secondary education enterprise be fully understood.

In any state there will be a variety of public, private and proprietary postsecondary institutions. The planning agency should give prompt study to the stated mission, goals and objectives of each of these institutions. One helpful approach is to survey the statutes or charters creating the various operations. Next a review of institutional publications will reveal how the institution advertises itself to external audiences. In all likelihood it will be discovered that many institutions present quite different data to different audiences. A student recruitment brochure is likely to emphasize a low student-faculty ratio, perhaps 10 to 1, while an institutional report seeking financial support from the state will stress the high productivity of the institution.

Development of an inventory of vital statistics for each institution including such items as enrollment, employees, physical plant, financial status including endowments programs offered, and the stated future goals, directions, and aspirations of the institution provides excellent planning resources. It cannot be stressed too strongly that each institution should be specifically encouraged to present a clear and full statement of mission to the planning body as a matter of record. This will provide the planning agency a base point for its work with each participant in the postsecondary educational enterprise in the state.

Fourthly, it is essential that proper differentiation and attention be directed within the on-going planning process to the components of total planning; strategic planning and tactical planning. In its 1971 report, "Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education," the ECS Task Force on Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education defined the two as follows:

STRATEGIC PLANNING. Strategic planning provides the framework within which tactical planning is developed and implemented. It is subject to few changes (if any) between major planning cycles and ought to reflect the fundamental assumptions about postsecondary education, the long-range societal objectives and goals, and the principal missions, roles, and functions of all educational institutions and agencies.

TACTICAL PLANNING. Tactical planning takes place within the parameters of strategic planning. Its elements include short- and intermediate-range goals, developmental time frames, and step-by-step means for achieving strategic goals. Tactical planning may be concerned with any element of postsecondary education, including such diverse items as new campus sites, new programs of instruction, research and public service, student grants and aids, building programs and priorities, budget formulas and processes, and management systems. Care must be exercised to insure that when tactical decisions amend or void strategic concepts all interested parties are fully cognizant of such proposed changes and are given public opportunity to debate their desirability. Tactical planning is a continuous process with one cycle overlapping or following immediately upon the previous one.

As defined, strategic planning establishes the "broad frame of reference, the fundamental premises and the philosophies and purposes" to be observed in tactical planning. Tactical planning, on the other hand, focuses on a limited set of issues and problems which have high priority within the larger strategic framework. Both processes are basic to sound planning and each has a direct bearing on the other.

Another principle which merits consideration is that all elements of the postsecondary education constituency should be provided an opportunity to participate in the planning process. There is no substitute for the involvement of interested and knowledgeable people. When lay citizens, legislators, faculty, students and administrators have continuing opportunities to assist in the identification of problems, provide ideas and formulate proposals they become the key to having "what is planned" become "what is."

It should be fully understood that the principle of involvement does not mean responsibility for the planning process is turned over to committees with diverse memberships. It does mean that the designated planning agency recognizes the value of obtaining advice and counsel from any and all constructive sources.

In strategic planning a cross section of all interests should be represented and highly competent staff personnel should be available to provide relevant background data and to serve as professional resource personnel. Often these advisory bodies are designed as blue ribbon committees on long-range planning, educational policy, etc. When such committees are created by the planning agency it is important that a charter or statement of responsibilities be developed and reviewed with the group.

In tactical planning more specialized advisory groups are often most helpful. For example, a committee of financial aid officers from public, private, and proprietary institutions may be the ideal body to advise on state policy for student aid. Similarly, a committee of academic deans from all sectors would be most valuable in academic program planning at the state level.

Before you ask, let me state that it does indeed take a great deal of staff time to work with a broad scope of advisory personnel. But I hasten to add that I know of no better use of staff time when measured by the potential long-range benefits which may accrue to the planning process.

The next principle I wish to stress is that sufficient current, relevant and reliable data must be developed and maintained. Sufficient is a key word. I use it by design. It will never be possible to have "all the data." Some charged with state-wide planning do not seem to understand this and wait and wait to get all the facts and in turn never really plan. Others act without determining what data can be obtained or without considering the possible value of additional data. Both approaches are indefensible.

Inasmuch as state-wide postsecondary educational planning and coordination will always be concerned with priority resource allocations of dollars, programs, buildings, personnel, etc., there will be those who take exception to any plan. Opponents of a plan will seek to discredit the planners and the plan by presenting information and facts which they will claim the planners did not properly consider or overlooked. If these opponents do indeed present "facts" not considered by the planners, regardless of the true importance of these facts, the credibility of both the planner and the plan is immediately in jeopardy.

With today's technology there is no reason why any planning agency should remain for long without a comprehensive data base and a management information system. It is a must. Here we are truly only beginning to make major strides. Much more will be said about this throughout the workshop. It is essential, however, to differentiate between what data is needed for strategic and tactical planning and what are just interesting.

Another principle which merits full consideration is that there must exist both the capacity and willingness to make and implement decisions.

This principle relates to the competence and commitment of both the policy planning body and its staff. It embraces both the "know how" and the "determination" of those responsible for state-wide planning.

A coordinating agency with clearly defined objectives, a commitment to quality higher education and to efficient management practices is going to find disfavor with some members of the higher education system and the public as well. If there is one thing that my years of experience in higher education planning and coordination has taught me is that many of the strongest advocates of coordination and planning, especially members of legislative bodies, quickly put this view aside when actions of a planning agency affect their alma maters or their constituency. In other words, coordination is a must in their view so long as it doesn't apply to "their school" or "their geographical area."

Related to the basic point that the staff and board members of a planning agency must have the capacity and motivation to make decisions is the necessity for the agency to be willing to oversee the implementation of decisions. Planners cannot be worried about winning, or for that matter, even engaging in popularity contests.

As an eighth principle for total state planning of postsecondary education I would urge that timely and continuous dissemination of information be provided. This element is closely identified with the decision making responsibility of the planning and coordinating agency. It is my personal opinion that one of the weakest characteristics of current state-wide higher educational planning and coordinating operations is the failure to disseminate information in an effective manner.

Up to now state planning agencies have focused on the publication of statistical reports and massive planning documents. These are necessary for certain audiences but they have little general public reader appeal. Brief summary reports attractively designed are very much needed to transmit a message to the general public. Extensive use should also be made of radio, television and the other media to transmit important policy decisions and new postsecondary educational developments.

Within the educational community all parties should be kept fully informed through in-house documents and both formal and informal reports and proceedings.

Lastly, I must stress the importance of meeting dates and official sessions of the planning bodies being fully known. Ample provisions should be made to accommodate all who wish to attend.

Another principle is that both the planning process and the postsecondary education plans should be given periodic review and evaluation.

Effective comprehensive planning and coordination is a continuous process. All facets require a close inspection to determine their effectiveness. Many informal review and evaluation procedures will take place as a matter of course. These are important, but not enough. Specific and planned check points must be built into the process to insure adequate evaluation of the process and the product.

There is a tendency in planning and coordination for those involved to become preoccupied with the "plan" which has been developed and because of this preoccupation fail to remain keenly attuned to changing conditions. For this reason it is imperative from time to time for those doing the planning and coordination to go outside the existing structure and obtain an impartial evaluation of the state of affairs. I favor a comprehensive external evaluation at least every five years.

There are a variety of other reasons why review, evaluation and revision must be a fundamental component of the coordinating process. The composition of policy boards change, economic conditions are in a constant state of flux, and enrollment patterns vary to mention but a few. Often planning and coordinating groups are assigned or somehow assume additional functions. I agree with the Carnegie Commission when it suggests that the agency's planning activities should be tested against the criterion: "Is it high level planning or low level regulation?"

The final planning principle I wish to identify is one which deserves special consideration because it is all too easy to overlook. It is a plea to be aware of the impact on planning which may result from a change in the cast of participants in the planning process. A new governor, a change in political party control of the legislature, new members on the postsecondary education planning board or a change in the executive officer of the planning board may all have a substantial influence on existing plans and provide new directions for future plans. The ramifications of this point are many. For example, new membership in the planning board may lead to a change in established funding guidelines for state financial support for postsecondary institutions or the enactment of more stringent or more liberal program approval provisions. Consider what this may do to the credibility of post-secondary education planning in the eyes of state legislators if full rationale for the change is not carefully presented. Or as another example, consider the impact on the planning process by having a governor assume office whose campaign theme was to cut state expenditures twenty percent in twelve months. These and other unanticipated events do take place.

Although each of the points identified could be discussed at length, I conclude with two general observations. While total state planning is indeed in its infancy, it will mature rapidly and successfully provided sound guidelines and planning principles are observed and participants in the process maintain a dedicated commitment to the task which is theirs. Comprehensive state planning is essential if adequate postsecondary educational opportunities are to be provided to the citizens of any state in the most efficient and economical manner.

Session I - Case Study 1

The Higher Education Council for Progressive State, the State agency established by statute to coordinate public higher education in the State, published eighteen months ago a State plan for higher education for Progressive State. In developing the Plan, the Council held extensive consultations with presidents and trustees of each of the 21 public four-year colleges and universities, the Chancellor and trustees of the 16-unit State Community College System and the presidents and board chairmen of the 14 private four-year colleges in the State. The Plan presented comprehensive data on enrollment projections, degree production, facilities (including utilization and quantitative and qualitative inventories), instructional costs, etc.

Immediate and subsequent reaction the the Plan was highly favorable. Within two months after the Plan was published, the Association of Private Colleges formally commended the Council "for its perceptive and common-sense recommendations for advancing the dual system of public and private higher education in the State." In addressing the State Legislature three months after the Plan was released, the Governor stated: "At last, the State has a clear set of guidelines to chart the course of higher education in the State for the immediate years ahead." A large majority of the recommendations requiring legislative action received favorable consideration by the Legislature in its annual session which ended six months ago. So, in summary, the future of higher education in Progressive State appeared to be firmly charted and broadly supported.

One categorical conclusion contained in the Plan was that the State needed no additional four-year colleges, universities, or professional schools--public or private. It was pointed out in the document that several private and public four-year colleges were underenrolled and that curriculum changes may be needed in these institutions to attract increased enrollment.

The Plan also noted that over the past several years considerable public concern had been expressed over the inability of the two law schools in the State (one public and one private) to accept all qualified

State residents who were applying for admission. Data were presented which revealed that only one out of every six qualified State applicants had been admitted to either of the law schools during the past year. The Plan pointed out, however, that the ratio of lawyers to total population in Progressive State was greater than the national average and to increase the number of law degrees awarded annually would yield more legally-trained manpower than a recent American Bar Association study had indicated was needed in the State.

Ten days ago (almost precisely eighteen months after publication of the State Plan), at a news conference called by Harvey College, one of the underenrolled four-year private colleges and the only senior institution located in the Capital City of the State, the President and Trustees of the College announced that the College and all assets would be given to the State, provided it would be converted into a State law school and graduate school of business.

The Trustees of the non-sectarian institution indicated that over the past two years it had been necessary to use reserve funds to meet operating costs, but that the College was debt free. They reported that the physical plant was valued at 16 million dollars; that the endowment and reserve fund at the end of the fiscal year would be approximately 1.5 million dollars; that the College was located within three blocks of the State Capitol and Supreme Court building; that the College site provided parking for 600 cars; and that Capital City was the largest city in the State and the closest law school or graduate program in business was in the State University 70 miles away.

Speaking also at the news conference was the President of the Capital City Bar Association, the President of the City Chamber of Commerce, the Mayor, and the Chairman of the State Senate Finance Committee (a lawyer and local resident), each of whom enthusiastically endorsed the proposal and commended the Trustees for their magnanimous offer to the State.

Contacted immediately after the news conference, the Governor, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House (all of the same and controlling political party) praised the Trustees for their generous offer and indicated they could see many positive benefits from such a development. Each indicated he would anticipate an early recommendation from the Higher Education Council as to the precise course of action that the State should take.

When the Chairman of the Higher Education Council was contacted by the news media at his home in Xville, 120 miles from Capital City, his response was one of disbelief. "Our plan is clear and fully understood," he replied. "We don't need another law school, and

certainly the State has no need to spend more tax money to support another State institution."

Within the next week, the Governor, by written request, asked the Higher Education Council to carefully review the offer (a copy of which he enclosed with his letter) and present a recommendation to him within two months.

Overnight, it seems, everyone decided to get into the act, with two strong camps, the "pros" and the"cons," quickly being formed. Resolutions were passed by the Trustees of the State University and several of the State four-year colleges opposing the proposal. Several of the private colleges expressed support for the development, as did many of the civic and professional organizations in Capital City. Reaction from individual legislators was broad and very clearly split on the proposal. Both the State Bar and the State Chamber of Commerce offered their cooperation and assistance to the Higher Education Council in their study of the offer.

The first meeting of the Higher Education Commission since the proposal was made by Harvey College is scheduled for tomorrow. The Chairman has requested each Council member to outline the procedure he feels the Council should follow in this matter.

Basis for Discussion

1. Assume you are a member of the Higher Education Council, state and justify the procedure you would propose.

2. Assume you are the Director of the Council (the professional executive), state and justify the procedure you would propose.

Session I - Case Study 2

For more than a year, the State Coordinating Council for Higher Education has worked to formulate a policy whereby a "comprehensive program of continuing education (both credit and non-credit offerings) may be provided in a non-duplicating, economical manner by the State institutions of higher education to citizens throughout the State." This is a charge to the Council by statute.

As finally developed, in consultation with the presidents of all the State colleges and universities, the policy provides for dividing the State geographically into continuing education regions, with the colleges in each region responsible for providing continuing education opportunities within that geographical area. Each region contains at least a community college, a four-year college, and a master's-

degree-granting institution. The policy further provides that the two comprehensive State universities may offer in any region throughout the State specialized continuing education activities which institutions within a region do not have the capacity to provide. The policy, in draft form, was endorsed by the public college and university presidents by a vote of 16 to 1. The one opposing vote was cast by the president of the State university currently providing undergraduate and graduate level continuing education offerings throughout the State.

In its formal announcement of the new policy, the Council indicated it would become fully operative within one year.

Shortly after the policy was disseminated, several public school superintendents indicated strong opposition, and soon thereafter, the State Association of School Superintendents, in its annual meeting, passed a formal resolution of opposition to the policy. Several superintendents were quoted in the press as saying "if the State university could not continue to provide continuing education offerings for their teachers, they would contract with out-of-State institutions for the service." (As a matter of information, these superintendents had sometimes been employed by the University to teach continuing education courses.)

With the State Legislature in session at the time of the Council policy announcement, a bill was soon introduced to authorize the State University to continue its existing scope of continuing education offerings, inasmuch as it had the expertise, experience, and support of the public school superintendents.

In spite of testimony by the Director of the Council of Higher Education and several college presidents in opposition to the bill, it passed the Education Committee of the State Senate and was approved by the Senate. The bill was then referred to the Education Committee of the House of Delegates.

A hearing by this Committee is to be held in three days.

1. As Chairman of the Higher Education Council, what action pattern do you recommend?

2. As Director of the Higher Education Council, what action pattern do you recommend?

Session I - Case Study 3

The policy of the State Council of Higher Education, which by statute must approve new degree programs before they may be offered

by the State institutions of higher education, requires institutions to submit and have approved letters of intent to start a new program at least two and one-half years before implementing a new program.

Several of the State four-year colleges have recently suffered substantial losses in enrollment and have excess faculty and facilities. Studies by the Council and others suggest that many students are seeking something other than a liberal arts undergraduate education. Thus, it appears that enrollment problems can be expected to continue for these institutions unless changes are made.

The presidents of four of the most severely affected colleges and the chairmen of their boards of trustees have requested the Council to revise its policy on program approval to permit requests to be submitted up to six months prior to the proposed date of implementation. A major argument favoring this revised timetable is that immediate and imaginative action must be taken to keep these institutions viable.

Institutions other than the four requesting the policy change have also expressed the desire for greater flexibility in initiating new programs. They argue that now is the time to return to the institutions a greater control over what they offer and when they offer it.

Basis for Discussion

1. As a member of the Council of Higher Education, what action do you recommend and why?